

REMARKS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Office Action dated 10 April 2003. Responsive to the rejections made by the Examiner in that Office Action, Claims 1-21 are now cancelled from this case, and Claims 22-44 are inserted for further prosecution. It is believed that with such insertion of Claims, there is a further clarification of Applicant's invention for this Patent Application.

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 1 and 12 for containing several informalities. As mentioned, Claims 1-21 as originally filed are now cancelled from this case. It is believed that newly-inserted Claims 22-44 now obviate the Examiner's formal concerns.

The Examiner also rejected Claims 1-3, 5-7, 10-18, and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Nagayama et al. reference. The Examiner further rejected Claims 4, 8, 9, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Nagayama et al. reference in view of the Abe et al. reference. In setting forth the latter rejection, the Examiner acknowledged that Nagayama et al. fails to disclose any insulating pads having an insulating material with moisture absorption properties, but cited the Abe et al. reference for disclosing such feature. The Examiner then concluded that it would have been obvious to employ a moisture absorbent insulating material in order to decrease moisture in the given device, so as to increase its life.

As newly-inserted independent Claims 22 and 43 each now more clearly recite, Applicant's organic electro-luminescence device includes among its features "a plurality of

MR3003-7

organic layer divisions formed on . . . first electrodes” disposed on a substrate. A “plurality of second electrodes [are] formed respectively on said organic layer divisions,” with “a plurality of rampart portions each disposed adjacent at least one of said organic layer divisions.” Each of these rampart portions is formed to “extend[] upward from said first electrodes to support an overhang portion.” Further, each rampart portion is formed with “a plurality of sections including” in certain embodiments “a bottom insulating pad section and a heat sink section formed of a conductive material,” and in certain other embodiments “bottom insulating pad section and a moisture absorbent section,” as Claims 22 and 43 respectively recite.

The full combination of these and other features now more clearly recited by Applicant’s newly-inserted Claims are nowhere disclosed by the cited references. Note, for instance, that the primarily cited Nagayama et al. reference repeatedly specifies its rampart 7 to be formed exclusively of an “electrical insulation” material (Col. 6; line 31; Col. 16; line 39). Nowhere does the reference disclose such rampart 7 to be of a multi-sectioned structure, much less one having both “a bottom insulating pad section and a heat sink section formed of a conductive material,” in the case of the combination recited by Claim 22, or having both “a bottom insulating pad section and a moisture absorbent section,” in the case of the combination recited by Claim 43. To the contrary, the reference emphatically boasts the various advantages to be gained specifically “because of the insulative layer 7,” (Col. 13; line 28) it prescribes.

Given such contrary teachings of the primarily cited Nagayama et al. reference, the teachings of the secondarily cited Abe et al. reference are found to be quite ineffectual to the present patentability analysis. The Abe et al. reference nowhere even suggests an organic

MR3003-7

electro-luminescence device having such features as “a plurality of organic layer divisions formed on . . . first electrodes to extend transversely relative thereto,” “a plurality of second electrodes formed respectively on said organic layer divisions,” “a plurality of rampart portions . . . extending upward from said first electrodes to support an overhang portion,” and others now more clearly recited by Applicant’s newly-inserted Claims.

It is respectfully submitted, therefore, that the cited Nagayama et al. and Abe et al. references, even when considered together, fail to disclose the unique combination of elements now more clearly recited by Applicant’s pending Claims for the purposes and objectives disclosed in the subject Patent Application.

It is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jun Y. Lee

Registration No. 40,262

Dated: 7/8/2003

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee  
3458 Ellicott Center Drive, Suite 101  
Ellicott City, Maryland 21043 USA  
Telephone: 410-465-6678